

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application to this point. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in a condition for allowance in view of the following remarks.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the limitations originally appearing in dependent claim 3. Accordingly, claim 3 has been canceled from the application without disclaimer or prejudice.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP10-02720 to Shinichiro *et al.* (hereinafter “Shinichiro”) in view of JP2001-052935 to Yutaka *et al.* (hereinafter “Yutaka”). However, Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections since the combination of Shinichiro in view of Yutaka fails to teach every feature of the claimed invention as required to maintain a rejection of those claims under §103(a).

Regarding claim 1, the absence of the claimed relationship between the outer diameter of the wire and the width of the secondary winding from Shinichiro was correctly noted in the Office action. Instead, the Office action explains that “Yukata discloses the width W1 of the winding 20 is smaller than the width T1 of the wire [T1 is number of turn multiplied by d as shown in figure 1 and Abstract.” But the alleged “width” T1 of the wire cited in Yutaka is actually the overall thickness of the primary winding around the bobbin, which would include the sum of all wire diameters aligned along their diameters in the radial direction and extending away from the center of the bobbin. Applicants respectfully submit that this is clearly different than the diameter d of the wire of the secondary winding recited in claim 1, and thus, both Shinichiro and Yutaka fail to teach that “*an outer diameter d of a wire of said secondary winding and a width t_1 of each of the divided wiring areas are so set as to satisfy the relation $t_1 < 11d$* ” as claimed in claim 1.

Further regarding claim 1, even assuming for the sake of argument that the dimension T1 in Yutaka corresponds to the diameter of the wire, which Applicants do not concede, the combination of references would still fail to teach the relationship between the dimension T1 and a width of each of the divided wiring areas for the secondary winding claimed in claim 1. First, the Office action calculates the dimension T1 as the number of turns multiplied by the diameter of each wire. However, Applicants respectfully disagree with this calculation. From the figures of Yutaka itself it appears that multiple turns can be arranged side by side (i.e., not aligned perfectly on top of each other) without adding to the dimension T1. Moreover, the cited portions of both Shinichiro and Yutaka fail to disclose dimensions, numbers of turns, or other information required to permit one of ordinary skill in the art to evaluate the dimension T1 and the width of a wiring area for the secondary winding, much less the relationship between those dimensions as recited in claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, the combination of Shinichiro and Yutaka fails to teach, among other claimed features, that “*an outer diameter d of a wire of said secondary winding and a width t_1 of each of the divided wiring areas* are so set as to satisfy the relation $t_1 < 11d$ ” as required to maintain a rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

To further distinguish claim 1 from the combination of references, however, Applicants have incorporated the limitations of dependent claim 3 into independent claim 1. Now, as amended, the combination of Shinichiro and Yutaka also fails to teach that “*an outer diameter d of a wire of said secondary winding, a width t_1 of each of the divided wiring areas and a thickness t_2 of said partition wall* are so set as to satisfy the relation $0.8t_2 < t_1 < 11d$, as claimed in amended claim 1. As mentioned above, neither Shinichiro nor Yutaka disclose any specifics regarding the relative dimensions of the outer diameter d of the wire of the secondary winding, the width t_1 of each of the divided wiring areas or the thickness t_2 of the partition wall. It follows that the combination of Shinichiro and Yutaka also fails to teach, suggest or otherwise render predictable that the “*outer diameter d of a wire of said secondary winding, a width t_1 of each of the divided wiring areas and a thickness t_2 of said partition wall* are so set as to satisfy the relation $0.8t_2 < t_1 < 11d$.”

The remaining claims in the present application, specifically claims 2, 4 and 5, are allowable for the limitations therein and for the limitations of the claims from which they depend.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. NGB-38833.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: /donald j. firca, jr./
Donald J. Firca, Jr. – Reg. No. 48,140

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: December 15, 2008